

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

The Examiner alleges that the title of the invention is not descriptive.

By the instant amendment, a new title has been provided that is clearly indicative of the invention in which the claims are directed.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

By the instant amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the concerns of the Examiner have been met and Claim 5 is in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jordan '392; Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stuebing; and Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jordan '392 or Stuebing.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Stuebing does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the ramp signal having a slope determined by the bias current and an input capacitance of the analog amplifier.

Stuebing discloses that the control bus 14 ultimately controls the slope of the ramp generator 20. As a consequence; the amplifier 38 has nothing to do with such control.

Jordan does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the ramp signal having a slope determined by the bias current and an input capacitance of the analog amplifier.

The ramp generator 156 is controlled by slew rate compensator circuit 174 and has nothing to do with amplifiers 158 and 160 and consequently this reference could not meet the above mentioned claimed limitations.

Jordan '392 discloses at column 6, lines 20-25 that slew rate comparator 174 provides current I_1 , I_2 , and I_3 to ramp 1 and 2 generator 156 and to ramp 3 generator 162 and ramp 4 generator 164.

However, these currents do not depend in any way on comparators 156 and 160, since the current is provided from the slew rate compensators circuit 174 to the ramp generators.

Now the Examiner's attention is directed to column 5, lines 35-45 where Jordan '392 discloses that if an error occurs in ramps 1 and 2, 16 and 30, respectively, current I_3 and I_2 are shifted from supplying ramp portion 90 and 92 to supply ramp portions 22 and 34 which in turn increases the slope of the ramps.

Consequently, the current I_2 , I_3 , and I_1 only depend on the error from the ramps and the comparators 160 and 158 do not influence the currents I_1 , I_2 , and I_3 .

The claimed invention requires a ramp signal having a slope determined by the bias current and the input capacitance of the analog amplifier.

There is nothing in Jordan to disclose that the analog amplifier controls the ramp signal.

Applicants appreciate the indication that if Claims 4 and 5 are allowed.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5633